



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/723,640	11/28/2000	Anton Tams	18584-00002	6490

7590 09/15/2003

John S. Beulick
Amstrong Teasdale, LLP.
One Metropolitan Sq., Suite 2600
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER

BACKER, FIRMIN

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3621

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SW

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/723,640	TAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Firmin Backer	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>6</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3621

Response to Amendment

This is in response to an amendment file on July 15th, 2003 for letter for patent filed on November 28th, 2000 in which claims 1-70 were presented for examination. In the amendment, claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17-22, 26-30, 33-35, 38, 41, 43, 47-49, 51, 54-56, 58, 61-63, 65 and 69 have been amended, no claims has been canceled and no claim has been added. Claims 1-70 remain pending in the letter.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Joseph (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2001/0034690) in view of Johnson et al (U.S. Patent Application Pub. 2002/0082860).

Art Unit: 3621

4. As per claims 1, 9, 30, and 43, Joseph teaches a method/computer program/apparatus (*a leasing system and method*) for operating a computer (*web server, 10*) to facilitate/initiate a lease transaction (*facilitating transfer of vehicle leases*), (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, and 11, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*) comprising prompting (*presenting individual/customer with computer generated buttons*) a customer (*user, 356*) to select a lease transaction type for a specific type of equipment to be leased (*assume lease, sell lease, add lease, modify lease, delete lease*) (*see fig 1, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*), prompting the customer (*directed to a screen page 22 at which customer/owner is prompted*) to provide information including criteria (*enter information*) required to generate a one document (*modify lease*) for the selected lease transaction type (*see page 2 paragraph 0024, 0025*) and generating (*linking user*) the document/term sheet (*modify lease*) using the customer provided information (*see page 2 paragraph 0026, 0027*). Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document. However, Johnson et al teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a

Art Unit: 3621

document (*see fig 1-7, 9-11, paragraph 0002, 0003, 0008, 0054, 0062, 0066, and 0069*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Joseph's Inventive concept to include Johnson et al's an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered be a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document because this would have provided an automated for processing that is easy to use, quick, efficient, and that decreases the amount of human intervention required conduct a leasing transaction thereby creating a method and system for automating the generation of documentation for leases so that a lessor can generate more business by providing for a simple, efficient system that saves the dealer time and energy in closing a deal.

5. As per claims 2, 10, 31 and 44, Joseph teaches a method wherein prompting a customer to select a lease transaction type comprises displaying a computer generated screen listing (*main menu page 20*) a plurality of lease transaction type selections (*see fig 1 page 2 paragraph, 0024*).

6. As per claims 3, 11, 32 and 45, Joseph teaches a method wherein the lease transaction type selections comprise at least one of a lease extension, a lease, and a purchase lease back agreement (*see fig 1 page 2 paragraph 0029*).

Art Unit: 3621

7. As per claims 4, 12, 33 and 46, Joseph teaches a method wherein for a lease extension, prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document comprises displaying information related to at least one lease to the customer (*see fig 2 paragraph 0026, 0029*).

8. As per claims 5, 13, 34 and 47, Joseph teaches a method wherein prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document comprises displaying a computer generated screen listing a plurality of equipment criteria and delivery requirements (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

9. As per claims 6, 14, 35 and 48, Joseph teaches a method further comprising the steps of searching a database to identify equipment which match criteria supplied by the customer in response to prompting the customer to provide information required to generate at least one document, and displaying to the customer at least some information relating to at least some of the equipment identified as a match from the database search (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

10. As per claims 7, 15, 36, and 49, Joseph teaches a method wherein a customer is prompted to select at least one of the identified equipment, and wherein generating the document comprises populating the selected document type/term sheet with data related to the one identified equipment (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

11. As per claims 8, 16, 37, and 50, Joseph teaches a method wherein the equipment comprises at least one of aircraft, aircraft engines, rail cars, locomotives, ships, vehicles, and containers (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*).

12. As per claims 17, Joseph teaches a database (*lease system, 354*) (*see fig 11*) comprising a first set of data including criteria for equipment to be leased (*vehicles information*) corresponding to an availability query (*search*) submitted by a customer (*customer/ user, 356*) and related to a lease transaction (*assume lease, sell lease, add lease, modify lease, delete lease*) (*see fig 1, 11, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*) a second set of data corresponding to equipment criteria for equipment for lease (*see fig 1, 11, page 2 paragraph 0025, 3 paragraph 0030*).

Joseph fail to teach a third set of data corresponding to predetermined search that are applied to match the first set of data with the equipment information and the second set of data and a fourth set of data corresponding to modifications of the first set of data that are made by the lessor.

However, Johnson et al teach a third set of data corresponding to predetermined search that are applied to match the first set of data with the equipment information and the second set of data and a fourth set of data corresponding to modifications of the first set of data that are made by the lessor (*see fig 1-7, 9-11, paragraph 0002, 0003, 0008, 0054, 0062, 0066, and 0069*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Joseph's Inventive concept to include Johnson et al's an inventive concept of a third set of data corresponding to predetermined search that are applied to match the first set of data with the equipment information and the second set of data and a fourth set of data corresponding to modifications of the first set of data that are made by the lessor because this

Art Unit: 3621

would have provided an automated for processing that is easy to use, quick, efficient, and that decreases the amount of human intervention required conduct a leasing transaction thereby creating a method and system for automating the generation of documentation for leases so that a lessor can generate more business by providing for a simple, efficient system that saves the dealer time and energy in closing a deal.

13. As per claim 18, Joseph teaches a database further comprising data corresponding to search results from execution of the availability query (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

14. As per claim 19, Joseph teaches a database further comprising data corresponding to a customer desired equipment configuration (*see page 3 paragraph 0031*).

15. As per claim 20, Joseph teaches a database further comprising data corresponding to availability of equipment for lease (*see page 3 paragraph 0038*).

16. As per claim 21, Joseph teaches system for generating (*system for providing*) lease documents (*lease document such as: lease (assume lease, sell lease, add lease, modify lease, delete lease)*) (*see fig 1, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*) comprising a database (*lease system 354*) comprising data (*information*) corresponding to equipment criteria (*vehicle profile*) for equipment for lease (*see page 3 paragraph 0030, 0031*); and a server (*lease system*) configured prompt a marketing executive (*lease seller*) to select a type of document to be generated and to provide information required to generate the selected document type (*see figs 1 and 11*,

Art Unit: 3621

paragraph 0032, 0033, 0034). Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered be a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document. However, Johnson et al teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered be a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document (*see fig 1-7, 9-11, paragraph 0002, 0003, 0008, 0054, 0062, 0066, and 0069*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Joseph's Inventive concept to include Johnson et al's an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered be a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document because this would have provided an automated for processing that is easy to use, quick, efficient, and that decreases the amount of human intervention required conduct a leasing transaction thereby creating a method and system for automating the generation of documentation for leases so that a

lessor can generate more business by providing for a simple, efficient system that saves the dealer time and energy in closing a deal.

17. As per claim 22, Joseph teaches system wherein the database further comprises at least one of data corresponding to an availability query submitted by a marketing executive and related to a lease transaction, data corresponding to search results from execution of the availability query, data corresponding to a marketing executive desired equipment configuration, and data corresponding to availability of equipment for lease (*see page 3 paragraph 0030, 0031*).

18. As per claim 23, Joseph teaches system wherein the server is configured to cause a screen listing a plurality of transaction type selections to be displayed at a client computer (*see paragraph 0024*).

19. As per claim 24, Joseph teaches system wherein the transaction type selections comprise at least one of a lease extension, a lease, and a purchase lease back agreement (*see page 2 paragraph 0024*).

20. As per claim 25, Joseph teaches system wherein for a lease extension, the server causes the client computer to display information related to at least one lease (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*).

Art Unit: 3621

21. As per claim 26, Joseph teaches system wherein to prompt a marketing executive to provide information required to generate the selected document type, the server is configured to cause to be displayed at a client computer a screen listing a plurality of equipment criteria and delivery requirements (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

22. As per claim 27, Joseph teaches system wherein the server is configured to cause the database to be searched to identify equipment which match criteria supplied in response to prompting the marketing executive to provide information required to generate the selected document type, and to display at a client computer at least some information relating to at least some of the equipment identified as a match from the database search (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

23. As per claim 28, Joseph teaches system wherein the server is further configured to prompt a marketing executive to select at least one of the identified equipment, and wherein to generate the selected document type using the customer provided information, the server is configured to populate the selected document type with data related to the one identified equipment (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

24. As per claim 29, Joseph teaches system wherein the equipment comprises at least one of aircraft, aircraft engines, rail cars, locomotives, ships, vehicles, and containers (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*).

25. As per claim 38, Joseph teaches a method (*a leasing system and method*) for operating a computer (*web server, 10*) for initiating a lease transaction (*facilitating transfer of vehicle leases*), (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, and 11, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*) comprising selecting (*selecting*), from an electronic interface (*web page 40*) a lease transaction type (*assume lease, sell lease, add lease, modify lease, delete lease*) (*see fig 1, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*), identifying, from the electronic interface, equipment (*type of vehicle*) desired to be leased (*see page 2 paragraph 0024, 0025*) and requesting, from the electronic interface, a term sheet (*information*) for the selected lease type and identified equipment (*see page 2 paragraph 0026, 0027*). Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document. However, Johnson et al teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document (*see fig 1-7, 9-11, paragraph 0002, 0003, 0008, 0054, 0062, 0066, and 0069*).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Joseph's Inventive concept to include Johnson et al's an inventive concept of a

Art Unit: 3621

database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered be a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document because this would have provided an automated for processing that is easy to use, quick, efficient, and that decreases the amount of human intervention required conduct a leasing transaction thereby creating a method and system for automating the generation of documentation for leases so that a lessor can generate more business by providing for a simple, efficient system that saves the dealer time and energy in closing a deal.

26. As per claim 39, Joseph teaches a method wherein the lease transaction type selections comprise at least one of a lease extension, a lease, and a purchase lease back agreement (*see fig 1 page 2 paragraph 0029*).

27. As per claim 40, Joseph teaches a method wherein for a lease extension identified the lease desired to be extended (*see fig 2 paragraph 0026, 0029*).

28. As per claim 41, Joseph teaches a method wherein identifying the desired equipment type and criteria (*see page 3 paragraph 0030, 0031*).

Art Unit: 3621

29. As per claim 42, Joseph teaches a method wherein the equipment comprises at least one of aircraft, aircraft engines, rail cars, locomotives, ships, vehicles, and containers (*see abstract, figs 1, 2, 3, pages 1 paragraph 006, 2 paragraph 0022, 0023*).

30. As per claims 51 and 58, Joseph teaches system (*a leasing system and method*) for facilitating a lease transaction (*facilitating transfer of vehicle leases*) for aircraft (*vehicle*) (*see fig 1, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*) comprising a database (*lease system 354*) comprising data for aircraft (*vehicle information*), a server (*lease system*) configured to prompt a customer (*presenting a customer/user, 356*) to select (*select*) a type of lease transaction (*lease document such as: lease (assume lease, sell lease, add lease, modify lease, delete lease)*) (*see fig 1, page 2 paragraph 0023, 0024*), prompt (*presenting to*) the customer (*user, 356*) to provide (*provide*) information regarding aircraft desired to be subject to the lease transaction (*see page 3 paragraph 0030, 0031*), and prompt the customer to request generation of a term sheet for the lease transaction (*see figs 1 and 11, paragraph 0032, 0033, 0034*). Joseph fails to teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document. However, Johnson et al teach an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the

Art Unit: 3621

customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document (*see fig 1-7, 9-11, paragraph 0002, 0003, 0008, 0054, 0062, 0066, and 0069*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify Joseph's Inventive concept to include Johnson et al's an inventive concept of a database for storing information relating to a plurality of equipment for lease including specifications for each piece of equipment and if the equipment is currently being leased the terms of the lease, matching the customer provided information with the equipment information stored within the database by applying predetermined search rules, receiving information entered by a lessor to modify the customer provided information for generating a document because this would have provided an automated for processing that is easy to use, quick, efficient, and that decreases the amount of human intervention required conduct a leasing transaction thereby creating a method and system for automating the generation of documentation for leases so that a lessor can generate more business by providing for a simple, efficient system that saves the dealer time and energy in closing a deal.

31. As per claims 52 and 59, Joseph teaches system wherein to prompt a customer to select a type of lease transaction, the server causes to be displayed on a customer computer a computer generated screen listing a plurality of lease transaction type selections (*see fig 1 page 2 paragraph, 0024*).

Art Unit: 3621

32. As per claims 53 and 60, Joseph teaches system wherein the lease transaction type selections comprise at least one of a lease extension, a lease, and a purchase lease back agreement (*see fig 1 page 2 paragraph 0029*).

33. As per claims 54 and 61, Joseph teaches system wherein for a lease extension, to prompt a customer to provide information regarding aircraft to be subject to the lease transaction, the server causes to be displayed on a customer computer information related to at least one lease to the customer (*see fig 2 paragraph 0026, 0029*).

34. As per claims 55 and 62, Joseph teaches system wherein to prompt the customer to provide information regarding aircraft to be subject to the lease transaction, the server causes to be displayed on a customer computer a display listing a plurality of aircraft criteria and delivery requirements (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

35. As per claims 56 and 63, Joseph teaches system wherein the server is further configured to search the database to identify aircraft which match criteria supplied by the customer, and to cause to be displayed on a customer computer at least some information relating to at least some of the aircraft identified from the database search (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

36. As per claims 57 and 64, Joseph teaches system wherein the server is configured to cause to be displayed on a customer computer a prompt to select at least one of the identified aircraft (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

37. As per claim 65, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium (*lease server, 354*) (*see fig 11, page 2 paragraph 0026*), comprising: a record (*data*) of customer submitted availability queries (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*), a plurality of rules (*search criteria/profile*) for matching (*matching*) equipment (*vehicle*) to the customer submitted availability queries (*see fig 4, 5, page 3 paragraph, 0038, 0039, 0040*) and a record of results from applying the matching rules to the customer submitted availability queries (*see page 4 paragraph 0039*).

38. As per claim 66, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the equipment comprises at least one of aircraft, aircraft engines, rail cars, locomotives, and ships (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

39. As per claim 67, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the availability query record comprises a query number and a model (*see page 4 paragraph 0039*).

40. As per claim 68, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium further comprising a record of required delivery dates comprising a query number, a delivery year, a delivery month, and a quantity (*see [age 4 paragraph 0043*).

41. As per claim 69, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium wherein the record of results comprises a result number, a query number, and a term sheet request (*see page 4 paragraph 0040*).

42. As per claim 70, Joseph teaches a computer-readable medium further comprising a record of availability (*see page 3 paragraph 0030*).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Firmin Backer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0624. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thu 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on (703) 305-9768. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3621

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



Firmin Backer
Examiner
Art Unit 3621

September 5, 2003



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600